UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
ADDRESS: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO
08/530,663	09/20/1995	BRENT KEETH	MI22-356	5492

23369 7590 03/07/2003

HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE LLP
750 BERING DRIVE
HOUSTON, TX 77057

EXAMINER
WILLE, DOUGLAS A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2814	

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	08/530,661	KEETH ET AL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Douglas A Wille	2814

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 February 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *6-10,18,19,22,23,25,26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *6-10,18,19,22,23,25 and 26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *37* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 6 – 10, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al. ('038) in view of Eimore, Nakamura et al. and Takahashi et al. ('000).

3. With respect to claim 6, Takahashi et al. ('038) shows (see cover Figure and column 8, line 17 et seq.) a DRAM device where the cell size is $6F^2$ (column 25, line 17) but does not show the minimum feature size, peripheral circuitry, array size or packaging. Eimore shows (see cover figure and column 8, line 9) a DRAM (column 1, line 9) where a 0.25 micron design rule is used (column 10, line 61). Nakamura et al. shows a DRAM (see cover Figure and column 3, line 66 et seq.) where a 16 M device is shown (column 4, line 25) and shows the chip includes, besides the memory array, timing, address, redundancy, data, test path and voltage supply circuitry. Takahashi et al. ('000) show (see Figure 1 and column 5, line 67 et seq.) a DRAM (column 6, line 10) where the die is encapsulated in a package with pins extending outwardly. It would have been obvious to include the peripheral circuitry show by Nakamura et al. since it provides a working device, to include the feature size shown by Eimore since it is known to be functional and to provide a 16M device since it is known to be useful. Note that with the 0.25 micron design rule the area of the memory is less than 6 mm^2.

4. With respect to claim 7, the memory array is shown by Takashima et al. ('038) as 4-level (see Figure 29 and column 26, line 34 et seq.) and since the peripheral circuitry does not have an integrated capacitor, it would inherently have less than 4-levels.

5. With respect to claim 8, Nakamura et al. show that Figure 1 matches the geometric arrangement of the actual chip and with the memory area being less than 6 mm^2, the whole chip will obviously be less than 35 mm^2.

6. With respect to claim 9, Takahashi et al. ('038) shows a structure with 5-levels (see Figure 47 and column 28, line 63 et seq.) and since the peripheral circuitry does not have an integrated capacitor, it would inherently have less than 5-levels. Also the memory will have an area of less than 6 mm^2.

7. With respect to claim 10, Nakamura et al. show that Figure 1 matches the geometric arrangement of the actual chip and with the memory area being less than 6 mm^2, the whole chip will obviously be less than 35 mm^2 and Takahashi et al. ('038) shows a structure with 5-levels (see Figure 47 and column 28, line 63 et seq.) and since the peripheral circuitry does not have an integrated capacitor, it would inherently have less than 5-levels. Also the memory will have an area of less than 6 mm^2.

8. With respect to claims 18, 19 and 25, the memory arrays with the density shown will have 270 devices in 100 $micron^2$.

9. With respect to claims 22, 23 and 26, the 16M device has no more than 68M memory cells and with the density shown will have 270 devices in 100 $micron^2$.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas A Wille whose telephone number is (703) 308-4949. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:15-3:45).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on (703) 308-4918. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Douglas A. Wille
Patent Examiner

March 5, 2003